

REMARKS

This amendment is being filed as a response to the Final Office Action of May 25, 2008. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of these clarifying amendments and remarks. This response is filed **within 2 months**, and therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests expedited consideration in accordance with the rules.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9-12 and 15-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falkenhaimer et al. (US Patent No. 5,930,801), in view of Chang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,953). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections in light of the amendments and arguments contained herein.

Applicant has amended each of the independent claims 1, 9, 10, and 15 to substantially include the subject matter of former dependent claim 5. Additionally, Applicant has further clarified the terms “mode enablement” and “account limitation” in former claim 5 as:

“mode enablement to determine if the requestor has permission to request the account” (see this or similar, but not necessarily identical language in the independent claims - see parg. [0035]); and

“checking for an account limitation to determine if a maximum number of accounts created has been reached” (see this or similar, but not necessarily identical language in the independent claims - see parg. [0035]).

The Office has asserted that these features are taught by Falkenhaimer in the following excerpt:

"Further according to a currently-preferred embodiment of the invention, all of the users of the system in FIG. 1 who desire any type of access to secured files in file system 12 must at some point "create an account" with the command utility 18. As alluded to in the above table of attributes within an object, users themselves are assigned handles by the command utility 18 at the time of registration, as if the users were files in a collection. That is, regardless of the name or internet or e-mail address of a particular user, upon creation of an account for a user, the command utility 18 will associate the name or address of the user with a newly-generated handle, which once again is simply an identification number which persists with the user forever. In the owner, reader, and writer attributes within an object, the users are identified not by their names or addresses, but by their handles.

When a user account is created, a utility within command utility 18 called a "community registry" creates a new object which includes data describing the user. The registration process includes the user filling out an electronic form, data from which is used in the user object. Such user information can include, for example, the user's legal name, hard-copy and e-mail addresses, website URL, and the names of user groups he wishes to be associated with (this is equivalent of naming "parent" collections for the user, assuming the user groups have handles and objects associated therewith, and may be subject to security considerations). Also, preferably, at this point the new user will be asked to type in a password he will use for future logins to the system. The password will be checked by the command utility 18 at all future times the user logs into the system" (Col. 8, line 50 - Col. 9, line 13 - emphasis added).

Falkenhaimer also teaches that "a guest entering the system creates an account on his own motion and does not have to receive specific permission" (Col. 14, lines 9-12). Thus, in Falkenhaimer's method, any user can create an account, which does not suggest a method to determine if the requestor has permission to request the account. In fact, enabling any guest user to create an account, as in Falkenhaimer, suggests an operation that is opposite from determining if the requestor has permission, as claimed by Applicant. Therefore, Falkenhaimer does not suggest a mode enablement to determine if the requestor has permission to request the account, as claimed by Applicant.

Additionally, Falkenhaimer does not suggest checking if a maximum number of accounts has been reached. Thus, Falkenhaimer does not suggest the independent claims as amended.

In addition, dependent claim 6 has been amended to further clarify the term “security token” as “security tokens to encrypt the account identifier and an account password” (see para. [0036]). With respect to the claimed feature of “security tokens,” the Office has referred to the excerpt included hereinabove to suggest this feature. Falkenhaimer suggests a password [to] use for future logins. However, Falkenhaimer does not suggest security tokens to encrypt the account identifier and an account password (emphasis added), thus Falkenhaimer does not suggest dependent claim 6 as amended.

In view of the foregoing, the Office is requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 6, 9, 10, and 15 under §103. The dependent claims are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons the independent claims are believed to be patentable. The Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6920. If any other fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ADAPP256). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP
/Jose M. Nunez/

Jose M. Nunez
Reg. No. 59,979

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6900
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901
Customer Number 25920